DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 728 CE 001 457

AUTHOR	Arnett, Melvin H.; And Others
TITLE	Influence of Selected Factors on Numbers of Office Visits and Telephone Calls Made to the Wilson County Extension Office, Lebanon, Tennessee.
INSTITUTION	Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. Agricultural Extension Service.
REPORT NO	Extension Study 48-SC-851
PUB DATE	Jan 74
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Characteristics; Adult Farmer Education; Extension Agents; *Extension Education; Family Influence; *Farmers; Farm Visits; *Information Seeking; *Participant Characteristics; Participant Involvement; Psychological Characteristics; Social Characteristics; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Tennessee

ABSTRACT

The study, undertaken to help a county Extension program meet more efficiently the needs of its clientele, identifies selected personal, family, and farm characteristics of 203 adult males who made office visits and telephone calls to the Extension office during a 3-year period, seeking information on production or marketing of farm products and/or the conservation and use of natural resources or resource development. The findings, presented in full, indicate that adults who frequently sought agricultural information through visiting and/or calling the Extension office were also highly involved in other phases of the Extension program and in other farm related agencies and organizations, and seemed to have characteristics related to innovativeness in the adoption of new farm technology. To reach a larger clientele, the researchers recommend: (1) informing those who frequently contact the Extension office of the latest and best farm technology and of the needs, problems, and opportunities of all farm people, for diffusion of this information to other farmers; (2) increasing use of communications media; and (3) initiating personal contacts through farm visits. (Statistical data is appended.) (AJ)

ED 092728

RESEARCH SUMMARY SERIES IN AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

Extension Study No. 48
S. C. 851

A Research Summary of a Graduate Study

INFLUENCE OF SELECTED FACTORS ON NUMBERS OF OFFICE VISITS AND TELEPHONE CALLS MADE TO THE WILSON COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE, LEBANON, TENNESSEE

by

Melvin H. Arnett, Cecil E. Carter, Jr.
and Robert S. Dotson

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION EDUCATION

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

January, 1974

CE 001457

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	ABSTRACT	ii
I.	PURPOSE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES	1
II.	METHOD OF INVESTIGATION	2
III.	MAJOR FINDINGS	3
	Relationship Between the Office Visits and Personal Characteristics of 203 Farmers In Wilson County	3
	Relationship Between the Number of Office Visits and the Family Characteristics of 203 Farmers.	4
	Relationship Between the Number of Office Visits and the Characteristics of the Farm Operation	5
	Relationship Between the Level of Telephone Calls and Personal Characteristics of the 203 Farmers in Wilson County	7
	Relationship Between the Number of Telephone Calls to the County Extension Office and the Family Characteristics of 203 Farmers in Wilson County.	7
	Relationship Between the Number of Telephone Calls to the County Extension Office and the Characteristics of the Farm Operation	9
IV.	IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	13
	APPENDIX	14

INFLUENCE OF SELECTED FACTORS ON NUMBERS OF OFFICE VISITS AND TELEPHONE CALLS MADE TO THE WILSON COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE, LEBANON, TENNESSEE

by

Melvin Haskel Arnett*

August 1973

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to determine the influence of selected personal, family, and farm characteristics of adult male farmers on the number of office visits and telephone calls individuals made to the Wilson County Extension office. The population and sample included 203 adult male farmers who made one or more telephone calls or office visits between August 15, 1969, and August 14, 1972. Data for the number of office visits and telephone calls made by each individual were taken from records kept by the Extension secretary. Data concerning the characteristics of individuals, their family, and their farm were secured from records in the Extension office, from the ASCS office, from personal knowledge Extension staff members had about individual farmers and through personal contact with farmers.

The chi square test was used to determine the significance of association between the number of telephone calls, the number of office visits and specific personal, family and farm characteristics. Computations were made by The University of Tennessee Computer Center.

*Date of completion of an M.S. degree thesis on which this summary is based.

Findings indicated that the farmer's age, race and whether or not he was a full-time or part-time farmer did not influence the number of visits made to the Extension office. However, education of the farmer was significantly related ($P < .05$) to the number of office visits made during the three-year period. Farmers who had attended high school or college made a larger number of office visits than did those completing eight or fewer school grades.

Although farmers who were members of the Farm Bureau, Grange, and community clubs made more office visits than did nonmembers, these differences were not statistically significant. Having children in 4-H did not influence the number of office visits made. However, a significant association was found between the number of office visits made and each of the following: employment of wife, wife being a member of a home demonstration club, the farmer serving as a 4-H Club leader, and his attendance at Extension meetings. Farmers who made a larger number of office visits tended to have wives who were not employed away from home and their wives tended to be members of a home demonstration club. Also, farmers who attended larger numbers of Extension meetings and who served as 4-H project leaders tended to visit the Extension office more frequently than farmers who were not 4-H project leaders and who seldom or never attended Extension meetings.

Distance from the farmers' farms to the Extension office was the only farm operation characteristic studied which was not significantly associated with the number of visits farmers made to the Extension office. A significant association was found between the number of office visits and type of farming enterprise, size of farm, gross farm income, yield of tobacco, serving as a director of Farm Bureau, being an ASCS committee member, serving

on the county quarterly court, and serving as a member of the county Agricultural Extension Committee. Farmers having dairy, beef, or tobacco as their major farm enterprise made more visits than did those with either swine, sheep, or poultry. Farmers with larger farms, more gross farm income, and higher tobacco yields made more office visits. More visits also were made by farmers who were directors of Farm Bureau, members of the ASCS committee, members of county quarterly court, and members of the County Agricultural Extension Committee.

Number of telephone calls made by the 203 farmers to the Wilson County Extension Office was not significantly related to a[illegible] of the personal characteristics studied (i.e. farmers' age, educatio[illegible], or farming status).

Farmers who served as 4-H project leaders, attended Extension meetings, and were members of a community club made more telephone calls to the Extension office than those not participating in these activities. Number of telephone calls was not associated with employment of wife, wife having membership in a home demonstration club, having children in 4-H, or being a member of the Farm Bureau or the Grange.

Distance from the farmers' farms to the county Extension office, size of farms, membership on the ASCS committee, or membership on the county court were not significantly associated with the number of telephone calls made to the Wilson County Extension Office. However, dairy and beef producers made significantly more telephone calls than did those having swine, poultry, or tobacco as their major farm enterprise. Farmers who had higher gross farm income and higher tobacco yields also made more telephone calls to the Extension office. Farm Bureau directors and members of the County

Agricultural Extension Committee made more telephone calls to the Extension office than did farmers who were not members of these organizations.

Implications and recommendations also were included in the study.

A RESEARCH SUMMARY*

This study was undertaken to help the Extension Leader and Extension agents in Wilson County provide a more efficient county Extension office properly serving individuals who visit or call the county Extension office. It was believed that the present study would be helpful in planning and conducting a more effective Extension program designed to meet the needs and interest of clientele in Wilson County.

I. PURPOSE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify selected personal, family and farm characteristics of 203 adult males of Wilson County, Tennessee, who made varying numbers of office visits and telephone calls to the county Extension office during a three-year period. These 203 farmers were primarily seeking information on production or marketing of farm products and/or the conservation and use of natural resources or resource development.

Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To determine the influence of selected personal, family and farm characteristics of adult males on the number of visits they made to the Wilson County Extension office.

---

*Melvin Haskel Arnett, Extension Agent, University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service, Lebanon, Tennessee.

Cecil E. Carter, Jr., Associate Professor, Agricultural Extension Education Section, The University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Robert S. Dotson, Professor and Head, Agricultural Extension Education Section, The University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service, Knoxville, Tennessee.

2. To determine the influence of selected personal, family and farm characteristics of adult males on the number of telephone calls they made to the Wilson County Extension office.

II. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The Population and Sample

The population and sample for this study included the 203 adult males who either telephoned or visited the Wilson County Extension office between August 15, 1969, and August 14, 1972.

Procedure for Collecting Data

Procedures for collecting data were designed to enable Extension workers in Wilson County to analyze characteristics of individuals making office visits and telephone calls to the county Extension office.

For a number of years the Extension secretary had recorded the name of each office and telephone caller, the staff member requested, the subject of the information requested, and the name of the Extension staff member giving the information. Daily and monthly tabulations of data were made for staff use.

Collection of Data

Data for the dependent variables (i.e. number of office visits and number of telephone calls) were taken from existing office records. Data concerning the independent variables were secured from other Extension staff members, Extension office records, records of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) office and from personal contact with those included in the study.

Analysis of Data

The chi square statistic was used to determine the association between each dependent variable and each of the independent variables. Chi square values which achieved the .05 level of significance were accepted as being statistically significant. Computations were done by The University of Tennessee Computer Center.

A contingency table analysis program was used to show the relationship between the number of office visits and the number of telephone calls made by the 203 adult male farmers to the Wilson County Extension office (dependent variable) and each of the independent variables. Output for this program gave two way frequency tables which included row, column and table percentages, chi square values and degrees of freedom.

Although research and null hypotheses were not stated, an assumed null hypothesis existed for each of the independent variables. The assumed null hypothesis for each independent variable was: There is not a significant relationship between the number of office visits or telephone calls to the county Extension office and each independent variable.

III. MAJOR FINDINGS

Major findings were classified and presented under headings related to the objective of the study.

Relationship Between the Office Visits and Personal Characteristics of 203 Farmers in Wilson County

1. Number of office visits was not significantly related to the age of the 203 farmers who visited the county Extension office between August 15, 1969, and August 14, 1972. There was, however,

some tendency for those under 55 years of age to make more visits.

2. Number of office visits was significantly related to the educational level of the 203 farmers who visited the county Extension office. Farmers who had attended high school or college made more office visits than did those completing fewer school grades.
3. Number of office visits was not significantly related to the race of the individual.
4. Number of office visits was not significantly related to the farm status of the individual farmer. There was a tendency, however, for the full-time farmer to make more visits to the county Extension office.

Relationship Between the Number of Office Visits and the Family Characteristics of 203 Farmers

1. Number of office visits was significantly related to the individual's wife being employed. Those farmers whose wives were not employed made more visits to the county Extension office than those whose wives were employed.
2. Number of office visits was significantly related to the individual's wife being a member of a home demonstration club. Those whose wives were members of the home demonstration club made more visits to the county Extension office.
3. Number of office visits to the county Extension office and serving as a 4-H project leader were significantly related. Those who were 4-H project leaders made more office visits than did those who were not 4-H project leaders.

4. Number of office visits was not significantly related to the individual's children presently being members of the 4-H Club. However, there was a tendency for individuals who had children in 4-H to make more visits to the county Extension office.
5. Number of office visits was not significantly related to the individual's membership in the Farm Bureau. There was a tendency, however, for Farm Bureau members to have made more office visits.
6. Number of office visits was not significantly related to the individual's membership in the Grange. However, there was a tendency for Grange members to visit the Extension office in Wilson County more frequently than nonmembers.
7. Number of office visits was not significantly related to the respondent being a member of a community club.
8. The number of office visits by the 203 Wilson County farmers in the study was significantly related to his participation in Extension meetings. Those who frequently or occasionally attended Extension meetings made more visits to the county Extension office than did those who seldom or never attended Extension meetings.

Relationship Between the Number of Office Visits and the Characteristics of the Farm Operation

1. Number of office visits was not significantly related to the distance that farmers lived from the county Extension office.
2. Number of Extension office visits was significantly related to the major farm enterprises of the farmer. Those with the dairy, beef, and tobacco enterprise on their farms made more visits than did those with swine, sheep, or poultry.

3. Number of office visits was significantly related to the size of farm of the individual. Those with larger farms (over 125 acres) made more visits to the county Extension office than did those with smaller (under 125 acres) farms.
4. Number of office visits was significantly related to the gross farm income. Those with a gross income of $5,000 and over made more visits to the county Extension office than those with less than $5,000 gross incomes.
5. Number of office visits was significantly related to the tobacco yields of the 203 farmers. Those with above average yields (1800 pounds) made more visits than did those with below average tobacco yields.
6. Number of office visits was significantly related to the individual being a Farm Bureau Director. Those who were Farm Bureau directors made more visits to the Wilson County Extension office than did those who were not Farm Bureau Directors.
7. Number of office visits was significantly related to the farmer being an ASC committee member. Those who were ASC committee members made more visits to the county Extension office than did those who were not ASC committee members.
8. Number of office visits was significantly related to the individual being a member of the Wilson County Quarterly Court. Those who served as members of the county court made more visits to the county Extension office than did those who were not members of the court.
9. Number of office visits was significantly related to the individual

serving on the Wilson County Agricultural Extension Committee. Office visits were higher by those serving on the county Extension Committee.

Relationship Between the Level of Telephone Calls and Personal Characteristics of the 203 Farmers in Wilson County

1. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to the individual's age. There was a tendency, however, for those under 55 years of age to have made more phone calls to the county Extension office.
2. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to the educational level of the adult farmer. There was a tendency, however, for farmers who had attended high school or college to make more phone calls than those completing fewer grades.
3. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to the race of the individual.
4. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to the farm status of the individual farmer. However, there was a tendency for the part-time farmer to make more phone calls to the county Extension office.

Relationship Between the Number of Telephone Calls to the County Extension Office and the Family Characteristics of 203 Farmers in Wilson County

1. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to the individual's wife being employed.

There was a tendency, however, for those whose wives were employed to phone the Extension office more times than those whose wives were not employed.

2. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to the wife being a member of a Home Demonstration Club.
3. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was significantly related to the individual being a 4-H project leader. Four-H project leaders made more phone calls to the county Extension office than did those not 4-H project leaders.
4. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to the children being members of a 4-H Club.
5. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to being a member of the Farm Bureau. However, there was a tendency for Farm Bureau members to have made more phone calls to the county Extension office than non-members.
6. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not significantly related to Grange membership.
7. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was significantly related to the farmer being a member of a community club. Those who were members of community clubs made more phone calls to the county Extension office.
8. Number of telephone calls made by individuals was significantly

related to his attending Extension meetings. Those who frequently attended Extension meetings made more phone calls to the county Extension office than did those attending Extension meetings less frequently.

Relationship Between the Number of Telephone Calls to the County Extension Office and the Characteristics of the Farm Operation

1. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not related to the distance farmers lived from the county Extension office.
2. Number of telephone calls was significantly related to the farmer's major farm enterprise. Dairy and beef producers made more telephone calls than did the swine, poultry, and tobacco producers.
3. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not related to the size of the individual's farm.
4. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was significantly related to the individual's gross farm income. Those with higher gross income made more phone calls to the Extension office.
5. Number of telephone calls was significantly related to tobacco yield on the individual's farm. Those with higher yield of tobacco made more phone calls to the county Extension office.
6. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was significantly related to the farmer being a director of the Farm Bureau. Directors of Farm Bureau made more phone calls to the county Extension office.

7. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not related to membership on the ASCS committee.
8. Number of telephone calls to the county Extension office was not related to membership on the Wilson County Quarterly Court.
9. Number of telephone calls to the Wilson County Extension office was significantly related to membership on the County Agricultural Extension Committee. Those serving on the County Agricultural Extension Committee made more phone calls.

The significance of association between the number of office visits and telephone calls made during a three-year period by 203 adult males who sought agricultural information and each of the 21 independent variables studied is shown in Table I. Tables II and III show the relationship between each dependent and each independent variable included in the study.

IV. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These findings seem to indicate that adults who frequently sought agricultural information through visiting and/or calling the Extension office were also highly involved in other phases of the Extension program and in other farm related agencies and organizations. Generally, individuals who frequently contacted the Extension office seemed to have the same characteristics often found to be related to innovativeness in the adoption of new farm technology.

Existing knowledge of how farm information is diffused would indicate that those who frequently contact the Extension office would have a key role in helping to spread the adoption of recommended farm practices to other farmers in Wilson County. In this regard, it would appear extremely

important that those who frequently contact the Extension office be served as completely, efficiently and effectively as possible. They should be informed not only of the latest and best farm technology, but also the needs, problems and opportunities of all farm people. They can also serve a vital role by feeding back to Extension the needs, problems, and opportunities of farm families, as they see them.

A general finding of past studies is that impersonal contacts (e.g. Extension bulletins, newsletters and radio and T.V. programs) with Extension Agents reach many more people than do personal contacts; and that personal methods reach an audience that is already contacted in the large part, by other methods. The present study would seem to generally support these earlier findings.

Like most types of Extension contacts, office visits and telephone calls are initiated by the farmer rather than the Extension Agent. One exception is farm visits; this type of communication may be initiated by the Extension Agent. Farm visits would seem to provide one means by which Extension Agents could contact the hard-to-reach among their clientele.

In their efforts to reach farmers who generally do not initiate the contact, Extension Agents in Wilson County cannot reduce present efforts to serve those who freely initiate contacts with them. As indicated earlier, these are important contacts from the standpoint of the general diffusion of agricultural information. However, it would seem very important to allocate resources necessary to establish personal communications with a much larger agricultural clientele. Also, impersonal contacts would appear to be very important not only in terms of serving the immediate needs

of the hard-to-reach, but also as a step toward expanding personal communications with a larger number of those who are not presently willing to initiate those contacts.

Findings of this study would indicate that the number of office visits and telephone calls could be increased through a more unified staff approach to the Extension program in Wilson County. Involvement of a family member in any aspect of the County Extension programs (i.e. adult agriculture, home economics or youth) would tend to increase the number of office visits and phone calls made by adult farmers seeking agricultural information.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Wilson, Meredith C. and Gallup, Gladys. "Extension Teaching Methods," Extension Service Circular 495, Washington, D. C., Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1955.

2. Kirby, Edwin L. "The County Office Nerve Center of Extension," Extension Service Review, Vol. 31, No. 4, April, 1960.

3. Knaus, Karl. "System in the County Extension Office," U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1951.

4. The University of Tennessee. Agricultural Extension Service, "Wilson County Plan of Work Projection," 1972.

5. Metropolitan Planning Commission Staff. Nashville-Davidson County and Regional Development Patterns, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.

6. 1969 Census of Agriculture, Part 31, Tennessee Section 2, County Data, Vol. 1, Bureau of Census, Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Commerce.

7. Kelsey, Lincoln D. and Cannon C. Hearne. Cooperative Extension Work, Ithaca, N. Y., Comstock Publishing Co., 1963.

8. Nichols, Joe Fayette. "Influence of Selected Factors on Level of 4-H Participation by Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Grade Boys and Girls in Bledsoe County, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1972.

9. Downs, W. A. "An Analysis of Office and Telephone Calls Made to the Agricultural Extension Service in Union Parish," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Louisiana State University, 1960.

10. McCormick, Robert W. "Office Calls, Telephone Calls, Mail Requests, and Answering Sets," in H. C. Sanders, The Cooperative Extension Service, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

APPENDIX

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variables	Number of Office Visits[a]	Number of Telephone Calls[a]
1. Age of callers	NS	NS
2. Education of callers	S*	NS
3. Race of callers	NS	NS
4. Farming status (full- vs. part-time)	NS	NS
5. Employment of wife	S**	NS
6. Wife's membership in a home demonstration club	S**	NS
7. Caller serving as a 4-H project leader	S***	S***
8. Children's membership in 4-H	NS	NS
9. Membership in the Farm Bureau	NS	NS
10. Membership in the Grange	NS	NS
11. Membership in a community club	NS	NS
12. Participation in county Extension meetings	S***	S***
13. Distance from farm to Extension office	NS	NS
14. Major farm enterprise	S**	S**
15. Size of farm	S*	NS
16. Gross farm income	S***	S**
17. Yield of tobacco	S***	S*
18. Served as a director of Farm Bureau	S***	S**
19. Served on ASCS Committee	S*	NS
20. Served on county quarterly court	S**	NS
21. Served on Agricultural Extension Committee	S***	S*

[a]S = statistical significant relationships; NS = not significant at the .05 level.

* Chi square test of significance: $p < .05$
** Chi square test of significance: $p < .01$
*** Chi square test of significance: $p < .001$

TABLE II

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE NUMBER OF OFFICE VISITS INDIVIDUALS MADE TO THE WILSON COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE, LEBANON, TENNESSEE, 1969-72

	Total Number of Office Visits						
	None	One	2-3	4-9	10-45	Total	Mean No.
	- - - - - - - - - - Percents - - - - - - - -						
Age of Respondent[a]							
55 years or over (N=102)	6	26	27	25	16	100	4.9
Under 55 years (N=101)	4	20	29	25	22	100	6.4
Educational Level[b]							
Eighth grade level (N=52)	6	39	27	17	12	100	3.9
Attended High School (N=125)	3	21	28	29	19	100	6.0
Above high school (N=26)	11	4	27	23	35	100	7.3
Race[a]							
Caucasian (N=190)	5	22	27	25	21	100	5.9
Black (N=13)	0	39	38	23	0	100	2.6
Farm Status[a]							
Full-time farmer (N=98)	3	17	32	27	21	100	6.8
Part-time farmer (N=105)	7	29	24	23	17	100	4.6
Wife Employed[b]							
Yes (N=84)	5	31	36	10	18	100	4.9
No (N=109)	6	19	23	32	20	100	5.8
Other (N=10)	0	9	9	55	27	100	10.2
Wife Presently Member of Home Demonstration Club[c]							
Yes (N=28)	4	18	21	39	18	100	5.3
No (N=165)	6	25	30	22	17	100	5.2
Does not apply (N=10)	0	0	0	40	60	100	15.2
Presently 4-H Project Leader[d]							
Yes (N=23)	0	0	0	30	70	100	14.0
No (N=180)	6	26	31	24	13	100	4.6
Children Presently in 4-H[a]							
Yes (N=34)	3	12	26	30	29	100	7.5
No (N=78)	4	32	24	21	19	100	5.8
Does not apply (N=91)	7	20	31	27	15	100	4.9

TABLE II,Continued.

	Total Number of Office Visits						
	None	One	2-3	4-9	10-45	Total	Mean No.
	- - - - - - - - - - Percents - - - - - - -						
Member of Farm Bureau[a]							
Yes (N=152)	4	20	26	28	22	100	6.4
No (N=51)	8	33	31	16	12	100	3.5
Member of Grange[a]							
Yes (N=22)	0	14	36	18	32	100	6.4
No (N=181)	6	24	26	25	18	100	5.6
Member of Community Club[a]							
Yes (N=31)	0	19	32	20	29	100	6.5
No (N=172)	6	24	27	26	17	100	5.5
Participation in County Extension Meetings[d]							
Frequent (N=47)	2	5	6	32	55	100	13.0
Ocasionally (N=68)	2	15	40	33	10	100	4.3
Seldom (N=63)	7	36	32	19	6	100	3.1
Never (N=25)	16	48	24	4	8	100	2.1
Distance From Farm to Office[a]							
Under 5 mi. (N=22)	18	14	36	18	14	100	5.2
5-10 miles (N=85)	2	25	33	24	16	100	4.6
11-20 miles (N=88)	4	24	23	27	22	100	6.3
21 miles and over (N=8)	0	25	0	38	37	100	11.1
Major Farm Enterprise[c]							
Dairy (N=31)	0	26	19	29	26	100	8.0
Beef (N=131)	6	14	31	29	20	100	5.8
Swine-Sheep-Poultry (N=35)	6	54	20	9	11	100	3.4
Tobacco and other (N=6)	0	33	33	17	17	100	3.5
Size of Farm[c]							
125 Acres and over (N=158)	5	18	26	29	22	100	6.3
Under 125 Acres (N=45)	5	40	33	13	9	100	3.4
Gross Farm Income[d]							
Under $5,000 (N=138)	7	30	32	22	9	100	3.6
$5,000 - $10,000 (N=49)	2	8	18	39	33	100	7.8
$10,000 - over (N=16)	0	6	19	13	62	100	17.3

TABLE II, Continued.

	Total Number of Office Visits						
	None	One	2-3	4-9	10-45	Total	Mean No.
	- - - - - - - - - - Percents - - - - - - - -						
Tobacco Yield[d]							
Above average yield (N=87)	2	13	31	20	29	100	6.2
Below average yield (N=55)	2	42	29	25	7	100	7.0
Does not apply (N=51)	14	18	20	31	17	100	3.5
Director of Farm Bureau[d]							
Yes (N=22)	0	5	9	41	45	100	12.7
No (N=181)	6	25	30	23	16	100	4.8
Member ASC[b]							
Yes (N=61)	0	13	30	36	21	100	7.4
No (N=142)	7	28	27	20	18	100	4.9
Member of Quarterly County Court[c]							
Yes (N=23)	0	4	18	39	39	100	9.0
No (N=180)	6	25	29	23	17	100	5.2
Member of County Agricultural Committee[d]							
Yes (N=8)	0	0	0	0	100	100	23.6
No (N=195)	5	24	29	26	16	100	4.9

[a]Chi square test of significance: $p > .05$
[b]Chi square test of significance: $p < .05$
[c]Chi square test of significance: $p < .01$
[d]Chi square test of significance: $p < .001$

TABLE III

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE NUMBER OF TELEPHONE CALLS INDIVIDUALS MADE TO THE WILSON COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE, LEBANON, TENNESSEE, 1969-72

	Total Number of Telephone Calls					
	None	1	6	7-44	Total	Mean No.
	- - - - - - - - - - - - Percents - - - - - -					
Age of Caller[a]						
55 and over (N=102)	58	9	8	25	100	1.0
Under 55 (N=101)	44	14	12	30	100	1.3
Educational Level[a]						
8th Grade or less (N=52)	64	12	6	18	100	0.8
Attended High School (N=125)	45	11	10	34	100	1.3
Above High School (N-26)	54	12	15	19	100	1.0
Race[a]						
Caucasian (N=190)	51	10	10	29	100	1.2
Black (N=13)	46	31	8	15	100	0.9
Farm Status[a]						
Full-time farmer (N=98)	56	7	8	29	100	1.1
Part-time farmer (N=105)	46	15	11	28	100	1.2
Wife Employed[a]						
Yes (N=84)	45	17	13	25	100	1.2
No (N=109)	57	7	8	28	100	1.1
Other (N=10)	36	9	0	55	100	1.7
Wife Presently Member of Home Demonstration Club[a]						
Yes (N=28)	57	7	11	25	100	1.0
No (N=165)	51	13	10	26	100	1.1
Does not apply (N=10)	30	0	0	70	100	2.1
Presently 4-H Project Leader[d]						
Yes (N=23)	17	0	4	79	100	2.4
No (N=180)	55	13	11	21	100	1.0
Children Presently in 4-H[a]						
Yes(N=34)	38	12	12	38	100	1.5
No (N=78)	46	13	10	31	100	1.3
Does not apply (N=91)	59	10	9	22	100	0.9

TABLE III, Continued.

	Total Number of Telephone Calls					
	None	1	6	7-44	Total	Mean No.
	- - - - - - - - - - - Percents - - - - -					
Member of Farm Bureau[a]						
Yes (N=152)	50	9	11	30	100	1.2
No (N=51)	53	20	6	21	100	0.9
Member of Grange[a]						
Yes (N=22)	46	18	0	36	100	1.3
No (N=181)	51	11	11	27	100	1.1
Member of Community Club[b]						
Yes (N=31)	29	16	10	45	100	1.7
No (N=172)	55	10	10	25	100	1.1
Participated in County Extension Meetings[d]						
Frequently (N=47)	30	2	4	64	100	2.0
Ocasionally (N=68)	59	15	12	14	100	0.8
Seldom (N=63)	53	11	15	21	100	1.0
Never (N=25)	60	20	4	16	100	0.8
Distance From Farm to Office[a]						
Under 5 miles (N=22)	27	14	18	41	100	1.7
5-10 miles (N=85)	59	11	9	21	100	0.9
11-20 miles (N=88)	48	13	9	30	100	1.2
Over 21 miles (N=8)	63	0	0	37	100	1.1
Major Farm Enterprise[b]						
Dairy (N=31)	48	16	3	33	100	1.2
Beef (N=131)	48	7	15	30	100	1.3
Sheep-Swine-Poultry (N=35)	63	17	0	20	100	0.8
Tobacco and other (N=6)	50	50	0	0	100	0.5
Size of Farm[a]						
Over 125 Acres (N=158)	49	10	9	32	100	1.2
Under 125 Acres (N=45)	58	16	13	13	100	0.8
Gross Farm Income[b]						
Under $5,000 (N=138)	56	14	11	19	100	0.9
5,000-10,000 (N=49)	43	8	8	41	100	1.5
Over $10,000 (N=16)	31	0	6	63	100	2.0

TABLE III, Continued.

	Total Number of Telephone Calls					
	None	1	6	7-44	Total	Mean No.
	- - - - - - - - - - - Percents - - - - - - - - - -					
Tobacco Yield[b]						
Does not apply (N=51)	37	12	10	41	100	1.5
Above average (N=87)	49	9	10	32	100	1.2
Below average (N=65)	63	14	9	14	100	0.7
Director of Farm Bureau[c]						
Yes (N=22)	23	5	9	63	100	2.1
No (N=181)	54	12	10	24	100	1.0
Member of the ASC Committee[a]						
Yes (N=61)	48	7	13	32	100	1.3
No (N=142)	52	13	9	26	100	1.0
Member County Quarterly Court[a]						
Yes (N=23)	74	4	0	22	100	0.6
No (N=180)	48	12	11	29	100	1.2
Member of Agricultural Committee[b]						
Yes (N=8)	25	0	0	75	100	2.3
No (N=N=195)	52	12	10	26	100	1.3

[a] [b] Chi square test of significance: $p > .05$
[c] Chi square test of significance: $p < .05$
[d] Chi square test of significance: $p < .01$
Chi square test of significance: $p < .001$